



## **Walling Off and Walling In**

### **Personal Privacy and Organisational Privacy in the Age of Digital Work**

Bagger, Christoffer

*Publication date:*  
2020

*Document version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Bagger, C. (2020). *Walling Off and Walling In: Personal Privacy and Organisational Privacy in the Age of Digital Work*. Abstract from Practices of Privacy, Copenhagen, Denmark.



---

# PRACTICES OF PRIVACY

Knowledge in the Making

---



CENTRE FOR PRIVACY STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF COPENHAGEN

ONLINE SYMPOSIUM

2020

The online symposium *Practices of Privacy – Knowledge in the Making* is an event hosted by **the Centre for Privacy Studies (PRIVACY)** at the **University of Copenhagen**, a centre for research excellence funded by the **Danish National Research Foundation**.

**PRIVACY** was established in September 2017 through a generous grant of 50 million DKK (approx. 6.7 million Euro) from the Danish National Research Foundation (DNRF). The PRIVACY research team examines how notions of privacy and the private shape relations between individuals and society across diverse historical contexts. We are particularly interested in indications of privacy as a quality and threat: in the emergence and development of the idea that too little privacy threatens the individual while too much may ruin society. PRIVACY focuses on Northern Europe during the period 1500–1800 when critical changes in individuals' relationship to society happened in that region. It brings together the fields of Church History, History of Architecture, History of Ideas, Legal History, and Social History.



## PRACTICES OF PRIVACY

Knowledge in the Making

How can we think about private practices of knowledge from a historical perspective?

Though we tend to associate knowledge with the mind, the intellect, or the brain, much of what we come to know starts with concrete engagements with the world: experimentation, rehearsal, repetition, habit formation, all of these are intrinsic to getting to know something, and getting to know it well. This sort of knowledge development is often done more comfortably in private. In the privacy of a study, a laboratory, a rehearsal hall, learners can afford to experiment without the fear of being caught making a mistake.

All of this is true enough of how people learn and share knowledge today. Could we, as historians, assume that a similar tendency towards privacy was true also for learners in the past? It is safe to assume that most of the existing historical sources on knowledge production have gone through some level of polishing. Very few traces are left that bear witness to knowledge in the making—when ideas were still rough around the edges—precisely because people must have been keen on keeping onlookers at bay. The challenge of examining these hidden practices is what we pose to historians at the symposium “Practices of Privacy: Knowledge in the making.”

From **April 24 to May 31, 2020**, presentations and discussions will happen on Absalon (<https://absalon.ku.dk/courses/42014>), to which you registered with your email. If you encounter any difficulties, please contact us via email on [nkk@teol.ku.dk](mailto:nkk@teol.ku.dk) or [nsp@teol.ku.dk](mailto:nsp@teol.ku.dk).

Thank you for joining us!

**Organizers:** Natacha Klein Käfer and Natália da Silva Perez




---

## KEYNOTE

---



### *Practices of privacy & the middling sort*

**Prof. Catherine Richardson** (University of Kent)




---

## PANELS

---



### **PANEL 1: Arts, Secrets, Techniques**

#### **Annemie D.G. Leemans - *The Secrecy Trope in Prescriptive Literature: An Investigation of Early Modern Sources***

Being a specialist in practical knowledge, I studied the fascinating literary genre of books of secrets. The diverging and converging lines with plain recipe books are most often vague and obscure due to transmission dynamics. Singular recipes or set of recipes were eagerly copied and transformed. I may state that it is, in fact, harder to find an original written procedure as a result of experimentation than a copied version of it. Recipes from various historical eras, from various knowledge branches, and various styles come together in various types of recipe books – or appear completely out of context.

In light of this reality, it is therefore hard to present a group of books of secrets. I will instead focus on the secrecy trope that comes along. Questions raised in this paper are: What makes a recipe a secret? Are there linguistic determinants for secrets? Are there rhetorical or literary devices for secrets, and how were they used? Why the need to build in secrecy? What were the boundaries of this secrecy? Who was involved? These questions make use of linguistic and literary approaches, next to a historical one.

Proposing a multi-linguistic set of sources, among which English, Italian, and Dutch, proves promising for the early modern era. However, knowledge circulating in this period often came from earlier times and was also passed on to the following eras. The secrecy trope is most interested in the protection of knowledge. The secrecy trope anticipates and coexists with the scientific revolution in the 17th century. A historical and philosophical approach will be in place here. This investigation is rooted in the research done for the publication *Contextualizing Practical Knowledge in Early Modern Europe* (Leemans 2019) but offers new material, approaches, and insights on the topic of the secrecy trope.

**Callan Davies & Hannah Lilley - *Crafting Private Practices: Middling Metalwork, Marking, and Monopolies in Early Modern England***

This paper, drawing on research from the Middling Culture project, explores what might be considered the “privatization” of certain forms of skill in early modern England, taking metalwork as its focus. We explore how private and protected organizational process (from the livery company to the monopoly) was a crucial element of the artisan’s experience, one that conferred both commercial and cultural capital upon practitioners and their products. The Goldsmiths’ livery company in London instituted a new private ballot voting system in 1572 to manage its affairs; just over ten years later, goldsmith George Langdale was awarded a patent and monopoly as the first trumpet maker in England. These two instances offer distinct but related examples of how private knowledge was protected and made profitable through craft industries and their institutions.

In turn, this paper suggests that monopolies grew within provincial familial settings. The Purdue family of Somerset became the best-regarded bell-founders in southwest England during the seventeenth century. They crafted bells for many of the principal parish churches, including St Mary Redcliffe in Bristol, and St Thomas’ church in Salisbury. Extant bells, contracts, and churchwardens accounts testify to their success and give an insight into the private practices that led to their monopoly.

Such practices instilled these craftspeople’s products with highly-specific meanings generated in their making, marking, funding, and use. Objects like bells held a practical function, and various meanings emerged when they were seen, heard, or touched by different audiences. Through metalwork, we provide a unique perspective on developing ideas of private craft practice and commercial monopoly in early modern England.

**Jørgen Wadum - *Secrecy and Deceit. Uncovering private practices unravels ambiguous views***

During the 19th and 20 century, the profession of a conservator-restorer became slowly established as a discipline in its own right. Even then, much secrecy about methodology and materials was rather the unspoken rule. Only little was shared of how and what was done to a painting during treatment. When current conservators are confronted with a restoration project, they often have to unravel the secrets of previous conservation studio practices. This may uncover often highly surprising results such as the covering of iconic paintings with either deliberately toned or pigmented varnishes, or even substantial over paint – none of which were ever recorded nor known to the public.

The museum visitor who until the 1990s were mesmerized by the skill of artworks such as Rembrandt van Rijn’s *Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp* (1632) or Johannes Vermeer’s highly intimate representation of a private moment in *Girl with a Pearl Earring* (c. 1660) were unaware that their experience was highly manipulated. In places, it was common practice to subdue the bright colors of old master paintings, revealed after removal of century-old creased and darkened varnishes, by applying a new strongly toned, so-called ‘gallery tone’ varnish on top. Early 20th century curators did not trust that the public would appreciate, nor understand if an old master painter would have employed bright and vivid colors.

Recent treatments of old master paintings, therefore, often reveal a double set of apparent secrets: that of the artist’s intent and one of the later manipulations.

**Sanne de Laat - *Privacy and Knowledge: Secrecy, Privacy, and the Scryer in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England***

The idea of private magicians is an idea that persists. However, there is a growing interest in the communities of magic practitioners, as Richard Kieckhefer’s clerical underworld demonstrates. This paper will focus on the communities of scryers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to

demonstrate that the distribution of knowledge by means of scrying was inherently something done in privacy but not necessarily in secrecy. One of the goals for a scryer and(/or) the master of the scryer was to procure knowledge. A patron often wanted to know who stole their goods, who was going to be their future spouse, or what their spouse was doing at that same moment. Knowledge was also sought by means of talking to angels or spirits in a scrying glass or mirror. These forms of the acquisition of knowledge were tied to private practice in people's homes but also implied collaboration on a larger scale.

John Dee, for instance, employed scryers such as Edward Kelley to facilitate his talking to angels to gain knowledge since he could not see anything in the crystal himself. He employed multiple scryers and invited people such as Adrian Gilbert, John Davis, and Albert Laski into his home to sit in on these angel conversations, which were facilitated by Edward Kelley's scrying. While this means that Dee's practices were not secret, they also were not as private as he would have liked: often, people barged into his office while he was scrying. While scrying practices were not necessarily secret, they were often private in a way, and one of the few ways to unearth them is by looking at court records and diaries of scryers to figure out how they sustained their communities of practitioners.

## **PANEL 2: Scholarly Practices**

### **Isabelle Lémonon Waxin - *Intimacy, privacy and restricted audience: Victorine de Chastenay's scholarly practices***

This proposal is based on the preliminary study of Victorine de Chastenay's manuscripts, mostly known for her *Mémoires* and a few translations. The countess belonged to the ancient French aristocracy and received an exceptional education for a woman during this period. Her taste for knowledge, fueled by her father since childhood, never faded. Throughout her life, she explored various fields of knowledge: literature, poetry, European and Oriental languages, history, politics, botany, mathematics, astronomy, etc. Her manuscripts and part of her *Mémoires* offer an insight into her private practices of knowledge in the making. In my talk, I will focus on the learning techniques she used as a child and later on, in her domestic space: letters to her father, reading notes with commentaries, dissertations, demonstrations, summaries of books chapters to her professors and herself... As a noblewoman, the social norms of her time forced her to study in dedicated spaces at dedicated times, sometimes hidden behind a folding screen. Chastenay's manuscripts reveal her economy of knowledge in the making, highlighting the necessity of a room of her own. Her intimate practices of writing nourished private exchanges with savants before being shared with a larger but restricted audience in institutional places (such as the labs of the *Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle*). Most of her knowledge production has never been published or even shared with other eyes but enabled her to attend public courses, to receive many well-known savants, and to be respected at Court.

### **Jacob Schilling - *Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff in Meuselwitz (1685). The conceptual and material difficulties of intellectual work detached from an institution***

Veit Ludwig von Seckendorff (1624-1692) is one of the most eminent intellectual figures in Germany in the second half of the 17th century. He was a councilor to several protestant German princes and the author of numerous books spanning topics from Political Theory to Church History.

However, on several occasions, these two roles – politician and scholar – came into conflict. On two occasions, Seckendorff asked to be released of his duties to pursue his scholarly projects. In the early 1680s, he finally withdrew to his private estate at Meuselwitz to write books “of his own design” – and no longer, however erudite, deductions in the name of his Princes.

This paper has two aims. First, to show the rather complicated political, even theological, implications of a career politician to retire into private life. Second, the material difficulties of a former politician, living on a rather remote estate, who is now – legally and spatially – detached from his former access to the archives and libraries: the “arcana.”

Seckendorffs literary remains are currently cataloged in a DFG-funded project at the Forschungsbibliothek Gotha. This project provides sources for innovative research and intriguing questions like the ones raised by this workshop.

**Markus Christopher Müller - *Scholarly habitus and private reflection in 18th century Munich. The diaries of Andreas Felix von Oefele***

In my presentation, I would like to regard the court librarian Andreas Felix von Oefele (1706–1780), who is the focus of the dissertation I published this year, as an example of the making of knowledge in an exciting transitional period between Baroque and Enlightenment. As a scholar at the Munich court and one of the most important Bavarian historians to this day, he kept a diary for over 60 years – an ideal source for the reconstruction of his strategies of self-fashioning, which allow his habit formation to be viewed in a reciprocal perspective. The daily entries in Oefele's diaries – mostly in Latin and French – can be seen as the direct result of practices of privacy, as they were neither intended for publication nor did they fall into other hands before his death. His strategies of protecting his own knowledge can be viewed in a broader discursive context of the Enlightenment, which also questioned traditional scholarly ideals with their strive for utility. As an ideal, Oefele aspired to the way of life of the long historicized era of late humanism: Erasmus of Rotterdam and Justus Lipsius. Oefele showed himself to be an actor who did not want his position at court, which gave him exclusive access to the elector, to be questioned. For this reason, he was just as hostile to the new academy movement as he was to the edition project of the *Monumenta Boica* – projects which were incompatible with the ideal of the baroque polymath. At the same time, the inner dimension of the scholar's life can be compared with the outwardly directed self-representation. Complaints about workload and melancholy carry the image of the indefatigable editor to the outside world and yet describe the inner life of the human being Oefele. His diaries, embedded in the entire literary estate, offer unique access to pre-modern knowledge practices in Bavaria.

**PANEL 3: Confidentiality & Exposure**

**Christoffer Bagger - *Walling Off and Walling In: Personal Privacy and Organisational Privacy in the Age of Digital Work***

Current organizations are under great demand to work towards an ideal of transparency and openness (Garsten and de Montoya 2008). One way in which this manifests is in the increased adoption of so-called “Enterprise Social Media” (ESMs), which are implemented to facilitate greater intra-organizational and easier exchange of knowledge (Leonardi et al. 2013). In this paper, I argue that all of this ignores the fact that secrecy is a foundational aspect of organizational life (Costas and Grey

2016) and in spite of the fact that organization members are very interested in managing their availability and personal privacy (Mazmanian et al. 2013; Gregg 2013). This paper will argue how both individuals and organizations must manage their privacy to function properly and how this may or may not be accomplished with the use of ESMs.

Based on empirical material from 12 different Danish and international organizations, this paper will discuss how individuals and organizations manage and navigate the visibility and availability of information on ESMs. My argument is that everyday practices on these platforms not only present dilemmas in terms of keeping information secret from non-organization members and available to everyone else, but also what information to keep secret from other organization members. Finally, I will discuss how organizations and individuals navigate the ideas of secrecy and privacy on a platform owned by a tech giant with a heavily data-based business model (Zuboff 2019), and how this affects their everyday behaviors and privacy practices.

The framework for this analysis will be that of “visibility management” (Flyverbom 2019) on the part of both employees and organizational management. The production of specific types of visibilities and transparencies are increasingly a central part of organizational affairs (Flyverbom and Reinecke 2017), and individuals’ lives.

**William Robert deJong-Lambert - “Priority Complex” v. Privacy: Hermann J. Muller and the Ownership and Exposure of Scientific Knowledge**

It was said H.J. Muller had a “priority complex”; he was obsessed that other scientists were stealing his ideas. This reputation began during Muller’s undergraduate years when he was a student in the laboratory of T.H. Morgan at Columbia University, the forefront of genetic research in the first decades of the 20th Century. Together, Morgan and his students created the framework in which genetics continues to be studied today. Despite this success, Muller was convinced his colleagues never gave him proper credit and even laid claim to discoveries that were his. This conviction followed Muller to the University of Texas, where he made his Nobel Prize-winning discovery that radiation mutates genes, and continued onto Indiana University, where he claimed his student James Watson, who along with Francis Crick was awarded the Nobel Prize for discovering the chemical structure of DNA, would never have made this discovery had Muller not paved the way.

Muller’s “tendency towards privacy” and paranoia regarding “the prowling eyes of competitors” was concurrent with his role as both “whistle-blower” and “Cassandra” when it came to radiation. Muller realized the dangers at a time when X-ray machines were used to measure feet in shoe stores, and doctors used radiation as routine treatment for acne and birth control. Muller’s critics, like Edward Teller, argued nuclear weapons could be used peacefully for mining, oil, and gas exploration. Muller’s opinion as a member of the committee organized to study the effects of radiation upon the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, that damage would not be apparent for years, was ignored. Muller spoke out and was censored. My presentation will describe this contradiction to ask what happens when the practitioner of privacy uses private knowledge to expose what they believe to be a threat-posing practice of privacy by others.



#### PANEL 4: Geographical Spaces

##### **Cristina Sasse - *"A proper direction to their places of abode": Street addressing and wayfinding in England, 1700-1830***

Finding one's way around a town, the house of a friend, or a specific shop, are everyday practices and challenges that involve the application of much implicit knowledge – knowledge of spatial patterns, routes, and directions, for instance, which is often acquired performatively and unconsciously. In 18th-century England, rapid urbanization, increased mobility, and intensified commercial exchange aggravated such challenges. This gave rise to various media designed to assist orientation and make local knowledge more readily available to wider audiences, for example, in maps, directories, and guidebooks.

One type of information particularly affected by this development was the street address of individual residents and businesses. While up until the beginning of the 18th century such directions, as used in advertisements and on letters, tended to be highly specific, detailed, and changeable, over the course of a few decades, they became more standardized and concise. This was closely connected to an increasing tendency to treat addresses as stable and clear-cut pieces of information that could be passed on, published, and retrieved easily. Originally fluid, tacit knowledge was thus transformed into standardized, explicit information, fixed on calling cards and in directories. However, these forms of publication not only served to facilitate social and economic interactions, but they also touched upon sensitive issues of privacy: Being easy to find was not necessarily desirable and, in fact, deemed rather risky by some, who consequently tried to keep information about their place of residence or work private.

This paper will sketch the development of styles and practices of street addressing in England between 1700 and 1830, drawing upon rich source material such as letters, directories, advertisements, and Post Office papers as well as contemporary novels. It serves as a case study of the complex relations between tacit and explicit, private and public knowledge.

##### **Liam Benison - *Utopia as a Source for Understanding Early Modern Privacy***

The aim of this paper is to make an argument for considering utopian fiction as a source for understanding the meaning of privacy in the early modern period. I will draw on findings from my doctoral study into the poetics of seventeenth-century metropolitan empirical geographies of spaces that now form parts of Australia. I investigated the ambiguities and questions raised in geographical discourse by the confrontation between observations of the Australian continent and the conception of *Terra Australis Incognita*, the huge southern continent theorized by Renaissance cosmographers, in part, to balance the weight of the landmasses of the northern hemisphere.

As part of my research, I studied early modern utopias in French, English, and Dutch set in *Terra Australis Incognita*. Utopian authors went to elaborate lengths to maintain their privacy and disguise their identity because their works made direct and indirect challenges to religious and political orthodoxies. They risked persecution for what they wrote, and many experienced exile and punishment despite attempts to distance their identities from their writing. One strategy to protect their privacy was to take advantage of the questions, contradictions, and ambiguities raised by the persistence of the idea of *Terra Australis Incognita* in geographical discourse. In this paper, I will discuss some examples of the use of geographical discourse by early modern utopists to safeguard their privacy.

## PANEL 5: Architectural Spaces

### **Christine Beese - *Remote seclusion or spatial isolation? Anatomy-towers in Göttingen and Jena in the 18th century***

When we think of privacy in the world of early modern science, we generally imagine a situation that has been chosen – perhaps because it is easier to explore God’s creation from outside society or so that no observer could uncover secret knowledge or witness the failure of experiments. Apart from a chosen solitude, there was also an externally forced privacy, which was caused by the social, moral, or legal refusal of practices linked with the field of research. Thus, rather than in remote seclusion, researchers found themselves in spatial isolation. This holds true for the German anatomist Johann Wilhelm Albrecht who in the early 18th century had to conduct his dissections in a so-called anatomy-tower close to the Albani-Gate in Göttingen. But while his successor Albrecht Haller had built a separate anatomical theater in Göttingen in 1738 to escape from his “disreputable exile,” the anatomy-department of Jena took the opposite approach and moved from an anatomical theater praised by Goethe as “very bright” to a tower at the south-west of the ancient fortifications in 1750. Is it possible that different attitudes towards privacy can be found within the same discipline at the same time? And could that be linked to different ideas of how knowledge is produced? In my contribution, I trace the relocation of the anatomy-towers in Göttingen und Jena considering the local research situation as well as the architectural, social, and performative values that were embodied in the built environment.

### **Natalie P. Koerner - *Professors’ Wives at Work: Private Practices of Knowledge in the Houses of Helmstedt’s Professors***

The notion of privacy in early modern history is grounded on contested territory. This paper examines architectural drawings, treatises, and a famous cookbook to show how privacy was constructed in the context of knowledge-making in the university town of Helmstedt. There, the so-called “professors’ houses” constitute a unique architectural typology that merges the house, the auditorium, the brewery, the farm, the boarding house, and the scholar’s study. In the professor’s house, his wife, modeled on the Lutheran ideal of the Hausmutter (house-mother), rented out rooms to students, brewed beer for further income, oversaw the cooking for family members, paid guests and professorial colleagues, supervised the farming activities in the connected gardens, devised medicinal remedies, worked on translations, and so on. This article focuses on the resultant production of knowledge done by the professors’ wives at home. While their husbands were teaching in the integrated lecture halls and the lodgers were studying in their rooms, the wives engaged in various less theorized and publicized practices of knowledge. Privacy is explored in this article as created in opposition to the directly advertised activities affiliated with the university’s knowledge production, which was distributed across the town in the houses of the professors. In order to unlock the private aspects of the houses of seventeenth-century Helmstedt, this article focuses on Maria Sophia Schellhammer (1647-1719), daughter of Helmstedt’s most eminent professor Hermann Conring (1606-1681) and wife of Helmstedt’s Professor of Botany, Günther Christoph Schellhammer. Maria Schellhammer was the author of a very popular cookbook *Die wol unterwiesene Köchinn*, which went through several editions in 1692, 1697, 1704, and 1713 respectively. This book and its illustrations offer an insight into how running the kitchen (*oikonomia*) was understood by the author as an activity that required “science, diligence and intelligence” comparable to “composing a letter or writing [a] book.” For an additional source on tracing the notion of privacy affiliated with knowledge-making activities in the professors’

homes, this article draws on the architectural treatise *Architectura privata* (1641) by Joseph Furttendach the Elder (1591-1667) who was active in the region as an architect.

## **PANEL 6: The Legal, the Religious, the Political**

### **Frank Ejby Poulsen - *Private academic debates and public knowledge: Hermann Conring's analysis of the Holy Roman Empire at the University of Helmstedt***

In 1641, a student of Hermann Conring's defended a dissertation called 'exercitatio' on the Roman-German Emperor, based on Conring's private lectures. The argument was that the German kings had no claim to continue the Roman empire. A year later, a book entitled *New Discourse on the Roman-German Emperor* was published under Conring's name, but without the name of the publisher or the place. It was almost a facsimile of the dissertation. Conring strongly disavowed authorship for this book in 1644 by publishing his own work, *The Roman Empire of the Germans*. Conring also claimed that the dissertation was the student's work, and did not reflect his views. However, the argument of the book, which was a controversial one at the time, is roughly the same in all versions, and many sentences are similar. Conring's 1644 book is, however, more detailed, more academic in its referencing and added resources. There is no doubt that the *New Discourse* is Conring's, if not in ownership, at least in meaning and spirit. We have, therefore, a case and a question mark, which have been investigated by Constantin Fasolt in several articles and a book. Why did Conring refused authorship for the *Discursus Novus*, and the *Exercitatio*? Fasolt investigated the question of authorship and the question of meaning and intent by Conring. Building on this secondary literature and analysis, I want to investigate the question of privacy in developing knowledge and ideas, and the relation to public knowledge in 17<sup>th</sup>-century Helmstedt. It is a presentation of a work-in-progress by formulating thoughts and hypotheses for future analysis of primary sources.

### **Lars Cyril Nørgaard - *Religious privacy between knowledge and experience***

During the age of confessionalization, knowledge about doctrinal matters was popularized and territorialized. The internalization of new norms through education, catechism, printed sermon collections, and prayer books went hand-in-hand with the censuring of rival opinions. In private, the individual believer was subjectively enticed to rehearse, repeat, and form habits that corresponded to official orthodox teaching. Such shaping of confessional identities permeates the religious culture of early modern Europe. In different contexts, groups and individuals created different kinds of privacies where they could rehearse what a matter of public interest was. My contribution surveys several such private spaces of religious learning and rehearsal. I will examine how prayer manuals outline such spaces as an ideal, how images depict them as the heart's union with the divine, and finally, how they play out in devotional praxis.

### **Paolo Astorri - *Normative Knowledge in the Making: The Case of the "Consultationes constitutionum saxonicarum" (1599-1601)***

The *Kursächsischen Constitutionen*, issued in 1572 by Electoral Prince August of Saxony (1526-1586), were one of the most important legislative acts of early modern Europe. They aimed to provide the Electorate of Saxony with a consistent and permanent body of laws. For their preparation, August of Saxony asked the jurists of the Law faculties of Wittenberg and Leipzig to meet and discuss the most

complex legal issues of the time. Consultations were held during the years 1569-1572 in Wittenberg, Leipzig, and Meissen. The result of these discussions was later collected and published in the three volumes of the so-called *Consultationes constitutionum saxonicarum* (1599-1601). The Consultationes include the opinions of some of the most famous jurists of the time, such as Johannes Schneidewein (1519-1568), Matthaeus Wesenbeck (1531-1586), and Jakob Thoming (1524-1576). These opinions are organized in the form of quaestiones, whereby a case is described, arguments pro and contra are examined, different authorities are weighed, and a decision is formulated.

The *Consultationes* were neither a body of laws nor a collection of judicial decisions but represented a private collection of legal opinions, an experimental exercise to find the right solution to current legal problems. A group of jurists translated existing normative knowledge into normative statements valid for specific cases. This paper will focus on the *Consultationes* as an example of normative knowledge production, seeking to answer the following questions: from which type of normative knowledge did these jurists draw? What methods and operational rules were adopted? What kind of normative knowledge was generated? What influence did it exert on the community of practitioners? What functions were performed in relation to the formation of normative orders?

### **Thea Sumalvico - *How Private is Religion? Debates in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century***

Tolerance is often one of the keywords when we think of enlightened ideas. And of course, it is most of the time religious tolerance we talk about. For most of the 18<sup>th</sup>-century theologians, tolerance is never without conditions, though. For Johann Salomo Semler (1725-1791), professor for theology in Halle in Prussia, for example, it was quite possible to have deviant religious opinions, but they should be kept in privacy. When it came to church preaching, the preacher had to stay with public, official opinions. True religion was something internal, a personal relationship to God. But that did not mean that church, as institution, becomes less important. With this separation of private and public religion, Semler tried to save both: Religious autonomy and institutional homogeneity, which gave stability. The latter became more and more important for Semler when he was attacked by enlightened thinkers from Berlin. In the context of the fight with them, Semler could even favor censorship.

Semler's theory about private and public religion might have had an impact on political decision. In 1788, the King of Prussia and his minister Johann Christoph von Woellner published an edict, where it was claimed that everybody, in privacy, had the freedom to believe what he wants. Everybody, it says, has to care for his own soul. On the other hand, it strictly bound priests to the teachings and dogmas of the church. There should no longer be a spread of heretic opinions in the name of "the enlightenment." The edict also banned religious communities, which acted in privacy and with secrets, since they could be harmful for the state. This raises the question: where is the border for religious privacy and tolerance drawn?

## **PANEL 7: Writing Lives**

### **Holly Day - *"To be reviewed by themselves in their moments of privacy": The Creation of Self-Knowledge in Eighteenth-Century Pocket Diaries***

In 1748, the London publisher Robert Dodsley pioneered a new contribution to the eighteenth-century print market: the pocket memorandum book. This popular publication represented the first kind of pocket diary commercially available, bundling together a variety of "useful and entertaining"

information, such as marketing tables, traveling distances, enigmas, and selections of poetry, with pre-formatted diary and accounts pages left blank for their owner to fill in with their daily experiences. By the end of the century, hundreds of competing brands were available, making memorandum books one of the most common means for members of the gentry and middling-sorts in Britain to record their everyday lives.

This genre has received little critical attention, in part because it falls short of modern ideals of introspective diarising: users were encouraged to write in a brief and unsentimental style, often lacking personal pronouns altogether, in order to generate factual records of their actions and expenses. Through the daily habit of recording, consumers were then able to review their own character in an “objective” fashion. As a genre, the pre-printed pocket memorandum destabilizes some of our conventional narratives about personal records and self-knowledge in this period, eliding simple distinctions by scholars such as Lynn Z. Bloom between private ‘bare-bone’ diaries and those written with an audience in mind. This paper draws on case studies of extant memorandum books to examine their status as personal records and how they shaped self-recording practices in pursuit of objectivity. It explores anxieties that these books may be subject to public review, as periodicals published transcriptions of supposedly “lost” memorandum books and users sought to protect sensitive information through the use of code and mirror writing. In doing so, this paper probes the relationship between the production of “authentic” self-knowledge and privacy in the early modern period.

#### **Jelena Bakic - *Camilla Herculiana: Private Practices of Knowledge Production***

The aim of this paper is to critically analyze the paratextual and epistolary rhetorical strategies connected with private practices of knowledge production, used by the Paduan natural philosopher, physician (*speziala*), and writer Camilla Herculiana (flourished in the second half of the sixteenth century). To legitimize her authorship, she used different rhetorical strategies. Her self-fashioning as woman, housewife, mother, and wife, her inclusive language, and her references to household maintenance, to solving daily problems, and to only having the night hours in which to learn, prove fruitful terrain for a rhetorical-cultural analysis. Such analysis can shed important light on the relationships between the private and public sphere, gender hierarchies, and the meaning of privacy in the late sixteenth century.

This paper will address the question: how and why does Camilla Herculiana subvert, exploit, and reverse the private characteristic of the epistolary genre and paratext, to make it a fruitful discussion about scientific themes, and about her own production of knowledge?

For such an analysis, this paper will focus on Herculiana’s three letters, her dedicatory epistle to Queen Anna of Poland, her address “To the readers” in her only book, *Lettere dii philosophia naturale di Camilla Herculiana speciala* (1584), and her words of defense before the Inquisition, documented in a book by Jacopo Menocchio, *Consiliorum sive responsarum* (1604).

Methodologically, this paper is based on a ‘slow close analysis’ of primary sources and adopts boldly an interdisciplinary approach, which juxtaposes social history, rhetorical theory, the history of ideas, as well as paratextual and epistolary theory.

**Joëlle Weis - *Women's private libraries as spaces of knowledge-making. The cases of Elisabeth Sophie Marie and Philippine Charlotte of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel***

The duchesses Elisabeth Sophie Marie von Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1683-1767) and Philippine Charlotte von Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel (1716-1801) both owned substantial collections of several thousand books. Elisabeth's library mainly contained theological literature, including 1200 bibles and a unique collection of texts by Martin Luther, which she used to compose theological pamphlets. In addition, she granted access to her collection to selected scholars, who in turn used the holdings for their research. Although more diversified, Philippine Charlotte's library functioned as a similar meeting place for scholars of the region and beyond. What is more, her papers give insight into the interaction of her book use and her own writing, which she did in her "temps de loisir." In contrast to using the neighboring ducal library, Philippine Charlotte was free to consult the books she wanted in the privacy of her chambers for as long she wanted and, most importantly, without being judged.

Thanks to the unique situation at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel today, it is not only possible to digitally reconstruct both libraries but also to identify most of the original copies, which are a rich source for the history of knowledge. Each book potentially becomes a witness for practices of reading, compiling, taking notes, organizing, learning, and writing.

In both cases, the privacy of the library gave these women the freedom to pursue intellectual interests that were hard to combine with their public roles as duchesses. The fact that both women expanded their libraries considerably after becoming widows only supports this observation: the private as well as "leisure time" could take more space. Based on these findings, this paper argues that, in early modern times, women's learning, as well as their knowledge production, benefited from, and in many cases needed privacy.

**PANEL 8: Becoming Private**

**Simone Pichler - *The Concept of 'Privation': Notions on the Practice of Concealing Practices in the Philologies During Early 19<sup>th</sup> Century German Idealism***

Many recently published studies on the historical praxeology of the philologies (or the humanities) have tried to explain the beginnings of what we nowadays call 'Deutsche Philologie' through the specific practices of its scientific entrepreneurs, who until nowadays' philological historiography are represented by the 'triarchy' of the brothers Grimm and Karl Lachmann. But when we look closer to their scholarly oeuvre and their letters of correspondence we can – in contrast to the heuristic aims of the praxeological approach – see that their own pursued concept of philology is anything else than 'practically' oriented. Why is that so?

In my talk I want to describe different examples of their work which show a certain, yet in the history of humanities surprisingly unconsidered, 'practice' of more or less actively concealing the everyday philological practices, not only of one's own but also, more general, of possible ways of their explanation or even transfer. Taking into account the concepts of historical epistemology within the historiography of science I want to explain how this specific approach to philological 'science' during early historicism (Historismus) was embedded in a certain worldview depending on certain (originally Aristotelian) cosmological and philosophical concepts provided by the contemporary natural philosophy, which contributed to an idea of philology utterly striving against a – as it seemed for the protagonists – forced 'positivation' of scholarly practices or objects during the individual, mainly tacit as well as private understood process of scientific (meaning wissenschaftlich) work.

I want to show that these set acts of privation are not a mere coincidence or personal mannerism of scholarly individuals as it seems in the first place, but instead have their own epistemological status within idealistic philology in early 19<sup>th</sup>-century Germany.

**Tilman Richter - *The Forging of One's Self. Practicing Signatures, Practicing Individuality***

A person's signature marks a zone of transition between the private and the public sphere. Not only does the signature represent the identity of the signatory but it's also said to provide information on their character traits and their personal style. The signature works not least as a sign of someone's authority, of their ability to express their intentions and have them taken into account in a meaningful way. Because of this, practicing and designing one's signature seem to be common among young people entering their adult lives (as can be seen in a multitude of online tutorials on the issue) as well as among people who are about to occupy a position where their signature might be read as a representation of more than personal matters.

To explore the connection between processes of individualization and the development of a signature I will offer an analysis of two authors practicing and designing their characters' signatures. While W.G. Sebald develops a signature for Ambrose Adelwarth to include it in his novel *The Emigrants* Thomas Mann's signatures for *The Confessions of Felix Krull* (Felix faking his father's and the Marquis de Venosta's signature) were never meant to be part of the novel and only belong to Mann's studies of his character. Using these examples, I want to show how the design of a signature can and will be read as a practice that informs individuality and how this link between a certain practice of writing and the understanding of subjectivity is culturally established. In the playful manner in which these authors establish a bodily sign for their characters they recreate a process that is at work in the formation of personhood between the private and the public.